

THOMPSON, RICHARD W.

DRAWER 10C

CONTEMPORARIES

71.2009.025.03906



# Abraham Lincoln's Contemporaries

Richard W. Thompson

Excerpts from newspapers and other  
sources

From the files of the  
Lincoln Financial Foundation Collection



and Aesop's "Fables," plus the Bible. From his earliest days, Lincoln knew the Bible, the Encyclopaedia Britannica says, "for it doubtless was the only book his family owned."

One must draw the conclusion that the hard work, the long winter nights of loneliness and grief, the life in the heart of the forest, the tantalizing taste of just enough education to make him hungry for more, the compassionate love given him by his stepmother, and the challenge of survival that existed every hour, combined to give him the ability to reason as few people of his century were able to reason.

He grew up in a nation that accepted slavery and racial inequality. It must be assumed that at first he accepted those things too. But he was the first president to free, by official executive act, any slave.

The Emancipation Proclamation had its ulterior aspects for the North, and it was inadequate; but it was a first and a courageous step. It was a step into the future, a step beyond Lincoln's own time, and it should be thus judged. So judged, it should be an inspiration for Americans to take bold steps beyond their own times for the betterment of the nation and the world.

Narrow confines of color, creed, sex, money, social position, or political partisanship do not fit the memory of Lincoln. Whatever follies he engaged in, he out-grew.

The sounds of the forest he knew, now echo across the plains, the deserts and the cities. Because his mind was capable of growth, humanity is better off. His devotion to freedom was contagious, and infected every part of humanity with which it came into contact.

One problem encountered in this contest was the inadvertent inclusion of a column by Walter Trohan titled "Why Should The Spirit Of Mortal Be Proud?" which was thought to be an editorial. As a columnist speaks for himself and an editorial writer reflects the policy of the newspaper, the article had to be eliminated from the contest, or at least could not be published and called an editorial.

In addition to the winners, the following editorials were submitted in the competition:

1. Enigma of Lincoln's Death Casts No Cloud on Stature  
*The Columbus Dispatch* (Columbus, Ohio)
2. Legacy of Lincoln  
*The Bridgeport Telegram* (Bridgeport, Connecticut)
3. Abraham Lincoln the Second  
*The News-Sentinel* (Fort Wayne, Indiana)
4. 'Something More Than Common'  
*The Indianapolis Star* (Indiana)
5. Stark Divisions Of The Age Evoke Reminder Of Lincoln's Timeless Aim  
*The Sacramento Bee* (McClatchy Newspapers) (California)
6. Lincoln's Courage Saved Nation  
*The San Diego Union* (California)
7. Lincoln's Wisdom  
*Hamilton Journal-News* (Hamilton, Ohio)

## The Richard W. Thompson Manuscript Collection

Richard W. Thompson (1809-1900), who served as Secretary of the Navy for three years and nine months of the Rutherford B. Hayes administration, preserved many of his papers connected with his long and varied career. The bulk of the collection, long in the possession of his daughter, Virginia Thompson Henry, was acquired by the Lincoln National Life Foundation prior to 1930. Since that date, some of the documents have been transferred to the Indiana State Library, and a few have been placed in the Hayes Memorial at Fremont, Ohio. Other papers are still retained by members of the Thompson family.

Only in a few instances did Thompson keep copies of his letters; however, the Abraham Lincoln collection in the Library of Congress contains a number of his letters to Lincoln during the period of 1849 to 1865. The *Index To The Abraham Lincoln Papers* lists eighteen different Thompson letters, twelve of which are addressed to Lincoln. *The Collected Works Of Abraham Lincoln* lists twelve items in the index relative to Richard W. Thompson which includes letters, memorandums, introductions, telegrams and etc.

Two original Lincoln letters and a telegram (not in Lincoln's handwriting) are a part of the Foundation's Thompson collection. They follow.

"Private

Springfield, Ill., June 18, 1860

Hon. R. W. Thompson

My dear Sir:

Your long letter of the 12th is just received, and read—I write this to thank you for it; and to say I would like for you to converse freely with Hon. Henry Winter Davis—And lest he be compromised, by inference for this, let me say that he and I never met, or corresponded—

Very truly your friend

A. Lincoln

"Private

Springfield, Ill., July 10, 1860

Hon. R. W. Thompson:

Dear Sir:

Yours of the 6th is received, and for which I thank you. I write this to acknowledge the receipt of it, and to say I take time (only a little) before answering the main matter.

If my RECORD would HURT any, there is no hope that it will be over-looked; so that if friends can HELP any with it they may as well do so. Of course, due caution and circumspection, will be used.

With reference to the same matter of WHICH YOU write, I wish you would watch Chicago a little. They are getting up a movement for the 17th Inst. I believe a line from you to John Wilson, late of the Genl. Land Office (I guess you

know him well) would fix the matter.

When I shall have reflected a little, you will hear from me again.

Yours very truly

A. Lincoln.

Burn this."

How many letters Lincoln wrote to Thompson during the Presidential Campaign of 1860 will likely never be known. Undoubtedly there were several in Thompson's possession and these were apparently tied in a small bundle which Thompson labeled (on the back of Lincoln's letter dated July 10, 1860), "A few letters from A. Lincoln during the Presidential campaign of 1860. Some were destroyed because especially confidential."

On May 27, 1864, Lincoln sent a telegram (not in his handwriting) to Thompson, residing in Terre Haute, Indiana, in answer to his letter regarding a military appointment for his son: "Your letter in relation to Gen. Hunter & your son just received. If Gen. Hunter should ask to have your son in his staff the request would be granted but the Gen'l is now actively moving in the field & is beyond telegraph. I doubt whether the promotion you think of is legally possible.

A. Lincoln"

Thompson married Harriet Eliza Gardiner on May 5, 1836, and she bore him eight children. The son mentioned in the telegram was Richard W. Thompson, Jr., who before he was eighteen, joined Lew Wallace's regiment, the Eleventh Indiana Volunteers. At the expiration of his term, he re-enlisted for three years. Having served more than a year on the staff of Major-General David Hunter, he wished to be returned to him again when placed upon active duty. However, no record has been found of the transfer of Captain Richard W. Thompson, Jr. from commissary duties with the Army of the Potomac to the staff of General Hunter.

The elder Thompson was born in Virginia and resided a short while in Louisville, Kentucky, before moving to Bedford, the County seat of Lawrence County Indiana. In 1843, he became a permanent resident of Terre Haute. He was admitted to the bar in 1834 and shortly thereafter elected to the Indiana legislature. In 1841, he was elected as a Whig representative to Congress for the term ending in 1843 and was again elected to Congress from Indiana for the term beginning in 1847 to 1849. This was the Thirtieth Congress of which Abraham Lincoln was a Whig member from Illinois.

While Lincoln and Thompson had practiced law in adjoining circuits and had frequently corresponded about legal matters, they did not become personally acquainted until they met in Washington, D. C. In the Thirtieth Congress they became good friends, and an interesting story was related



From the Lincoln National Life Foundation  
Colonel Richard W. Thompson from a Daguerreotype taken in 1850. In 1834 Thompson was made a member of Indiana Governor Noah Noble's staff and assumed the complimentary title of colonel.

concerning their friendship by Mrs. Henry, the daughter of Col. Thompson, to Philip S. Rush, at one time a reporter for the *Terre Haute Tribune*:

"During the last year of Col. Thompson's term in Congress, he received an invitation to a large reception to be held at the home of one of Washington's social queens. Being well acquainted with the hostess, Col. Thompson asked permission to bring with him a young friend from Illinois, Abe Lincoln, and the hostess consented, although she had never heard of the Illinois congressman before. Lincoln did not care to enter the society of the capital, however, and at first declined to go to the reception, but finally agreed to accompany Thompson. The home was an elegant one, and the affair a brilliant gathering of Senators, diplomats, cabinet members and representatives, and the awkward Lincoln felt and appeared very ill at ease in the assemblage. In after years Col. Thompson described him, telling of the difficulty he had with his long, ungainly legs, and how he appeared at a loss to know what to do with his hands.

"During the evening, however, it was noticed that the hostess and Lincoln were engaged in a spirited conversation, in which the woman appeared deeply interested in her new acquaintance, while the Illinois congressman apparently forgot his embarrassment and was much more at ease. Some time later Col. Thompson met the lady and asked her what she thought of Lincoln. 'I think', she replied, 'that he is the only one who attended the reception who will ever be president of the United States'. Whether or not there were other future presidents at her home that night is not now known, but the prediction of

this hostess was made many years before Abraham Lincoln had more than a local fame."

There were periods in their careers when the political views of Lincoln and Thompson differed widely, but they continued to remain friends. On the eve of the election of 1860, Thompson expressed confidence in Lincoln as a conservative leader. He said: "If Mr. Lincoln is elected to the presidency he will be entitled to the respect of every man in the United States. His strength consists of his conservatism." Referring to the issues which concerned the South, Thompson said: "They want the fugitive slave law executed. Mr. Lincoln says that it shall be executed. They want the right of territories recognized to come into the Union as slave states. Mr. Lincoln says it shall be recognized. They want the rights of all states preserved. Mr. Lincoln says they shall be preserved. He differs with them on . . . the Wilmot Proviso. Lincoln says it should be passed to prohibit slavery in the territories. But there cannot be any Wilmot Proviso during Lincoln's term, if he is elected, because the Democrats will have a majority in the Senate until 1865 and they can prevent the passage of such a measure."

However, Thompson thought the Constitutional Union party was more national in scope than any of the others, and he made the surprising statement, prior to the election, that, ". . . I helped to nominate Mr. Bell and shall vote for him and nobody else."

A cordial relationship existed between the two men during the war years, and it has been stated that Lincoln considered Thompson for a Cabinet appointment. In fact, it has been fairly well affirmed that Presidents Taylor, Fillmore and Lincoln made him proffers of national offices, all of which he declined.

Complete accord between the two men was impossible, and these differences have been elaborated upon by Charles Roll in his book *Colonel Dick Thompson — The Persistent Whig*, Indiana Historical Bureau, 1948. Thompson thought that Lincoln was much too lenient with those who impeded the progress of the war, and one major difference of opinion had to do with Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation. Thompson's views and those of his conservative friends were outlined in a letter to the President, dated January 26, 1863. The letter was never sent and it is now in the Thompson collection in the Foundation's archives (See *Lincoln Lore*, Number 1451, January, 1959).

Thompson approved of Lincoln's plan of reconstruction, and he favored the re-nomination of Lincoln for a second term. In fact, he served as an Indiana elector, and, when that State cast its votes for Lincoln, Thompson was able to cast an electoral vote for his former Whig comrade in Congress.

The greatest contribution to the Civil War effort on the part of "The

Persistent Whig" from Indiana was the recruitment of soldiers and their organization after their enlistment. President Lincoln appointed Thompson provost marshal of the Seventh Congressional District on May 1, 1863, and his war activity proved to be the busiest period of his long life.

Lincoln's old friend, after the second inauguration, expressed fears for the President's life. He wrote a letter to John D. Defrees, in which he expressed serious concern about the possibility of Lincoln's assassination, and Defrees read the letter to Lincoln "who said that he did not have the same apprehension that his friend had. He did not think there was any danger." However, before Defrees reported the incident to Thompson, the assassin had struck. The entire Thompson family viewed the President as a personal friend and there was a great deal of gloom at Terre Haute.

Thompson was never an admirer of Andrew Johnson, and he viewed with alarm his selection on the Union party ticket for the vice-presidency in 1864. True to form Johnson relieved Thompson of his office as Collector of Internal Revenue for his district (Lincoln's appointment) in 1866.

The Thompson collection of manuscripts in the Foundation's archives, in addition to the letters written by Lincoln, are of great historical value to the Lincoln and Civil War students as well as the Indiana and United States historians. Some of the documents deal with Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation; there are anti-Lincoln letters, letters dealing with the Civil War and the assassination, Ku Klux Klan material, letters that mention Lincoln, letters of Presidents of the United States and quite a number of manuscripts that are unidentified. A large file of manuscripts contain notes for Thompson's speeches and addresses and some 574 letters addressed to Thompson, from Abbott to Yeatman, have been alphabetically catalogued and filed.

Thompson saw all the Presidents of the United States from Jefferson to McKinley and "was personally acquainted with most of them." In 1894 The Bowen-Merrill Company of Indianapolis published Thompson's two volume works titled *Recollections of Sixteen Presidents From Washington To Lincoln*.

One unique accomplishment of Col. Dick Thompson, which is of little historical significance is that "for fifty years prior to his death he smoked an average of twenty cigars a day." However, a more conservative account states that, "his doctor finally had to limit him to four cigars a day." In 1898, Robert G. Ingersoll wrote Thompson that, "I think that if I can only smoke enough I may live to be eighty-nine." Thompson died February 9, 1900, eight months after the celebration of his ninetieth birthday, the last survivor of the "Indiana General Assembly of 1834 and of the Twenty-Seventh and Thirtieth Congresses."



# Lincoln Lore

March, 1974

Bulletin of The Lincoln National Life Foundation...Mark E. Neely, Jr., Editor. Published each month by The Lincoln National Life Insurance Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46801.

Number 1633

## TREASON IN INDIANA

### *A Review Essay (Cont.)*

so different that some picture Copperheads as traitors on the brink of pulling the rug from under the Union, others as harmless lunatics on the fringe, and others as misunderstood victims of Republican oppression and propaganda. Instead of clarifying, Curry participates in the confusion which has dogged historians of the Copperheads from the start. The problem is one of definition. Are Copperheads Democrats, peace Democrats, or traitors?

Even Curry is not sure. On the very first page of his article he posits Copperheads and Republican Radicals as polar opposites, blaming the Radicals for interpreting the Copperheads' political dislike of emancipation, infringements of civil liberties, and the draft as "disloyal" and "treasonable." Here "Copperheads" clearly connotes "most Democrats" — only seen unfairly by the anti-slavery faction of the Republican party. Yet *most* Republicans and not just radicals were capable of seeing Copperheads in large numbers. The case of Richard W. Thompson provides an excellent example. Thompson was a conservative Whig turned Constitutional Union man in 1860. During the secession crisis, he himself envisioned a Northwest Confederacy, or rather a middle nation stretching from Virginia to California but excluding the South and New England. In the Thompson Manuscripts in the collections of the Lincoln Library and Museum is a letter written from Thompson to Governor John Letcher of Virginia on December 22, 1860, which begins this way:

Such is the fearful posture of our public affairs that we are all trying to look into the future, to see in what way the in-



*From the Indiana Division, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis*

Oliver P. Morton

The villain of Henry Adams's novel *Democracy* (1880) is Silas P. Ratcliffe, "the Prairie Giant of Peonia, the Favorite Son of Illinois." The novel's plot centers on the gradual discovery of the corrupt practices Ratcliffe uses to gain his politically powerful position as a strong contender for the presidential nomination. Like all the characters in the book, Ratcliffe is a blend of traits taken from the Washington life Adams had viewed at first hand. One of the models for Ratcliffe was certainly James G. Blaine, but another one may well have been Oliver P. Morton, a United States Senator by the time Adams was observing the Washington scene. One of the first ambiguous clues to Ratcliffe's character is the revelation that as wartime governor of Illinois, he had falsified election returns in order to save his state and ultimately the nation from being won "by the peace party." The event may well have been drawn from Morton's reputedly high-handed methods of saving Indiana from the Democrats. In actual fact, Tredway's book reveals that Morton frequently acted the part of a moderate, refusing to send troops to quash insurrections imagined by hysterical provost marshals and local Republican politicians. Only in the case of the election year of 1864 does Morton appear as the prime mover in attempts to exacerbate the Copperhead problem.

terest of the several sections is to be preserved and advanced. It will not do to let the material prosperity of the Country be all sacrificed and destroyed by political or sectional broils, — and whether the Union shall remain intact or be finally & entirely dissolved, every reflecting man must see that the central belt of States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, must always share a common destiny. In the event of dissolution they would have no difficulty in forming a satisfactory union, — leaving the extreme north to indulge its vagaries alone, and the extreme South to develop its capacity and resources in its own way.

When the Emancipation Proclamation was issued, Thompson remained true to his lifelong acquiescence in the existence of slavery and drafted a long protest saying that it was constitutionally unjust and racially dangerous. This petition is also among the Thompson manuscripts at the Lincoln Library and Museum; the following passages are representative of Thompson's sentiments expressed in the petition of January 26, 1863:

We have still a nation to be preserved, — the constitution yet survives the shock of battle, — and we should prove recreant to the obligations which rest upon us as citizens of a government, hitherto the happiest in the world, were we to omit to do, whatever we may rightfully do, to perpetuate it for our children. . . . The gallant and noble-hearted soldiers who compose this army, have obeyed your call with unparalleled alacrity, and have willingly exchanged the comforts of home for the

hardships of the camp and the hazards of the battlefield, that they may fight for the Constitution. . . . Such an army may be trusted . . . so long as this great object is kept steadily before it. What it would become, if another object were substituted for this, infinite wisdom can alone foresee. . . . You have, however, . . . thought it to be your duty to take a still further step — *beyond the law* — and to issue a *proclamation* giving freedom to the *slave* property of every loyal man, woman, child and lunatic, who is so unfortunate as to reside within the limits you have defined. By this act, . . . you propose that loyal citizens shall be punished by the forfeiture of their property, when, *by the law*, they are held guiltless of any offence against the Government. . . . the question whether slavery advances or retards the prosperity of a State, or whether the slave of a loyal man shall still remain in bondage, or be made free, must be left where the Constitution leaves them, — to the States themselves . . . .

Here was constitutional delicacy worthy of a Copperhead. In the petition Thompson also answered abolitionists' criticism with the Copperheads' stock argument based in racial fear:

[Mr. Seward] furnished . . . a complete answer to all their [the abolitionists'] clamorous denunciation of your avowed policy, and to all their vaporing about an emancipation crusade. He said . . . "Does France or Great Britain want to see a *social revolution*, with all its horrors, like the *slave revolution* in St Domingo? Are these powers sure that the country or the world is ripe for such a revolution, so that it may be certainly successful? What, if inaugurating such a revolution, slavery, protesting against its *ferocity and inhumanity*, should prove the victor?"

Yet Richard Thompson became a Republican, possibly as early as 1860. When the war came, he served first as commandant of Camp Vigo (later named Camp Dick Thompson) in Vigo County, recruiting and organizing Indiana soldiers to put down the rebellion and, eventually, to free the slaves. In 1863, Lincoln appointed him provost marshal of the Seventh Congressional District in Indiana. His recruiting and organizing activities continued, but he also began to engage in what might be called matters of internal security. He reported disturbances like the murder of a draft enrollment officer, blaming it on a group of some 1,200-1,500 potentially rebellious citizens. He reported rumors that arms were being shipped into the district at an alarming rate, and he urged inspections of packages to detect such shipments. He even employed a spy who signed his letters "H." to report to him regularly on the activities of potentially disloyal local groups. In short, Thompson believed in and reported to state officials a sizeable Cop-

perhead menace. His suspicions may have been paranoid, but they were not, at least, the products of a Radical imagination. Nor would private warnings and the clandestine employment of spies seem to be necessary simply to fabricate a Copperhead menace for political ends; that could be accomplished without any knowledge, and the noisier the accomplishment the better.

Most often, Curry seems to mean by "Copperhead" not *most* Democrats but the *conservative* Democratic faction. Indeed, the upshot of most revisionist writing about the Copperheads is to show that very few, if any, Democrats were Copperheads, if by that term one means treasonous opponents of the war. Curry refers to revisionist writings about "the aims and objectives of conservative northern Democrats" which dispute "the Copperhead stereotype." Three pages further on, he refers to the "Peace Democrats, a label attached to those Copperheads unrealistic enough to believe the Union could be restored if only North and South could be persuaded to come together at the conference table." Yet Curry quotes without comment Robert Rutland's remark that "the hard core of the Copperhead movement was located . . . in the areas voting Democratic in pre-war Iowa" as though it said the same thing of Iowa that Eugene Roseboom did of Ohio when he said that "the Peace Democrats of Ohio were the old-line, hard-shell Democ-

rats." Is a Copperhead by definition a Peace Democrat or are the Peace Democrats only the "unrealistic" faction of the Copperheads? It is hard to tell from Curry's article. The confusion is serious. When Curry says, "Kenneth Stampp goes one step further by arguing that Hoosiers living in the southern part of the state, because of their dependence upon the river trade, had more to fear economically from a successful rebellion than people in any other section," what does it imply? Does it mean there were no Copperheads in southern Indiana because everyone supported the war from fear of disruption of the river trade? Or does it mean the Copperheads in southern Indiana supported the war? If the latter, how does one tell a Copperhead from a War Democrat?

It is hard to compare studies of Copperheads because it so often boils down to comparing apples and oranges. Some are studying peace Democrats, some are studying Democrats in general, and some seem to be studying conservative Democrats who like the war but are not War Democrats, whatever that is. Among those studying peace Democrats, some are studying people who wanted reunion but thought an armistice would bring it about, and some are studying people who wanted peace on any terms. The result in historiography is that we know little of the Democratic party in general — even of its 1864 presidential candidate's political views — because historians so often focus on treason trials when they start out to find out what exactly Democrats be-



From the Lincoln National Life Foundation

Richard Wigginton Thompson (1809-1900) is famed for his nationalism. Like his exact contemporary Abraham Lincoln, Thompson was a Whig until he perceived that the party was dead. Thompson's perception of the party's demise came in 1852 (much earlier than Lincoln's), and thereafter their ways parted for a while. Thompson became active in Indiana's Know Nothing movement, remained in that movement after most Know Nothings deserted to the Republicans, and became a member of the Constitutional Union party. Thompson thus avoided joining the Republican party (which he thought was a sectional party) until the secession crisis; even after joining the Republicans, he remained critical of their policies on race and worked mainly to restore the Union. Despite the conservative love of the Union seemingly exemplified in this superficial capsule of Thompson's political career, the actual limits of his nationalism are discussed in this *Lincoln Lore* and reveal further the complexities of evaluating his enemies in the Civil War, the Copperheads.



lieved and did from 1861 till 1865.

Curry's article and most of the works attempting to exonerate the Copperheads mesh perfectly with the work of revisionists of the history of pre-Civil War America (like Beveridge, Milton, and even Robert Johannsen). William Dusing describes this school of thought accurately in a little-known book entitled *Civil War Issues in Philadelphia, 1856-1865* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965):

A revisionist interpretation stresses the ill consequences of the abolitionist and radical Republican agitation against slavery. According to this view, Northern radicals (together with their counterparts, the Southern "fire-eaters") provoked an unnecessary war by arousing popular emotions about issues which, rationally considered, were of little importance. In the wartime North the most noteworthy political disputes took place, not between Democrats and Republicans, but between disruptive radicals and sober conservatives within the Republican Party. Conservative Republicans, it is implied, had much in common with the great bulk of the Democratic Party, which loyally supported the war; "Peace Democrats" were of comparatively little significance.

Thus Dusing explains the spirit of much of the revisionist work on Copperheads and, in particular, Curry's suggestion that Copperheads were the constructs (real or imagined) of Republican Radicals. Dusing himself holds that there seem to be very sharp contrasts between Republicans and Democrats, and the difference between the factions within the two parties may not be as sharp.

Analysis of Curry's confusion is a round-about way of pointing up the most misleading and glaringly inaccurate part of Tredway's book, the title. Calling what he studies the "Democratic" opposition to the Lincoln administration caused severe disappointment for this reader. I expected a study of the speeches of Daniel Voorhees and Thomas Hendricks or of the voting records of Democrats in the Indiana legislature or of the voting records of Indiana's Democratic representatives in Washington. Such a study was needed before Tredway's book, and it still is. The Democratic party during the Civil War remains the dark continent of American history, shrouded in mystery, misconception, and sensational rumor. Tredway began his book in a way that would have been a valuable corrective to Curry's error, documenting profound differences between Republicans and Democrats. But he ended the book as a captive of the old-fashioned view, minimizing the seriousness of the Indiana Copperheads' intentions and strength.

The title is doubly disappointing because of its reference to the "Lincoln Administration." Abraham Lincoln's relationship to the events in the book is sketchy, but he gets the blame for everything Tredway hates. It is an avowedly anti-Lincoln book. Tredway announces in the "Introduction" his intention to "pursue what may be described as a critical approach to the administration of Abraham Lincoln and its policies." Yet it is a study of resistance to Oliver Morton, to various Union military commanders in Indiana, and even to draft enrollment officers. Some were Lincoln appointees, and some were not. Morton, certainly, was no appointee; he was the governor elected by the people of Indiana. Besides, is every last mail-carrier, even in the days before civil service reform, a member of the "administration"? Nonetheless, by the end of the book, Tredway comments on the "distinct streak of ruthlessness in the Civil War President" and says "the true Lincoln nobody knows" was "the man of blood and iron."

Tredway's documentation of these charges depends on two critical events, one of which did not even occur in Indiana, federal interference with elections in Kentucky, and Lincoln's aid in Morton's scheme to arrest the alleged traitors. If the first event is so important for Tredway's book, his reference to "Indiana" in the title misleads once again, though he does make a good point that awareness of events in neighboring Kentucky alarmed Democrats in Indiana. It should be added that Tredway relies heavily for his account of Kentucky events on the work of E. Merton Coulter, a notoriously pro-Southern source.

Lincoln's help to Morton seems the most important, if for no other reason than that it links Lincoln directly to the events in Indiana, the avowed subject of the book. Moreover, Lincoln's aid seems to have escaped comment by previous writers. During the summer of 1864, Governor Oliver P. Morton and federal authorities represented primarily by General Henry B. Carrington in Indianapolis were contemplating the arrests of some of the alleged leaders of the Northwest Conspiracy. The major Republican newspaper in Indiana urged hanging the men, but it urged they get that sentence by regular process in civil courts. General Carrington, a former abolitionist and associate of Salmon P. Chase noted today primarily for his ruthless suppression of domestic foes, also wanted them tried in ordinary civil courts and wanted only a few select leaders to be arrested. Governor Morton, on the other hand, was an elected official. Feeling the pressure of the coming autumn elections, he wanted the alleged traitors arrested in August; it was "essential to the national cause in the coming elections." Moreover, Morton wanted them to be tried by military commission. Tredway relates what ensued (the chronology is a bit loose):

General Heintzelman, commander of the Northern Department, shared Carrington's view that the exposures and arrests of August and September had achieved the necessary political effect and refused to sanction Morton's proposal. The governor then went to the President, who had no inhibitions. Lincoln organized the District of Indiana separately from the Northern Department so as to by-pass Heintzelman and replaced Carrington with General Alvin P. Hovey, who had no compunctions about military arrests and trials. Hovey assumed command on August 25, [Bowles and Dodd were arrested in September] and for good measure Heintzelman was superseded by General Joseph Hooker on October 1. A new wave of arrests began on October 5 and added the names of Bingham, Heffren, Humphreys, and Milligan to the list of prominent prisoners.

Tredway's account of the incident is an improvement upon Stamp's in that Tredway makes explicit who accomplished the shake-up in Indiana's federal high command. Stamp implies that it was Morton but does not say what authorities Morton had to convince:

... Morton feared delay and frankly asserted that an immediate trial was "essential to the success of the National cause in the autumn elections." Hence he quickly obtained an order for Carrington's removal. On August 25 the Governor secured the appointment of Gen. Alvin P. Hovey, a political general from Indiana who was thoroughly in sympathy with his course.

But from whom, one wonders. Tredway says it was from Lincoln, but his source is apparently the same as Stamp's, the Carrington Papers. Stamp had no apparent motive to keep Lincoln's connection silent; his book, after all, was written to exonerate Indiana Democrats from charges of Copperheadism or disloyalty. Tredway cites no source in any Lincoln collection nor any evidence at all that Lincoln changed officers to satisfy Morton. Hovey's instructions, which authorized him, according to Tredway, "to make military arrests, to organize military courts and employ them to try citizens, and to carry their sentences into effect," came from the Assistant Adjutant General. To a man uninformed about the situation, Hovey might have looked more lenient than Carrington, for Hovey was an Indiana native and a former Democrat. To carry the great weight of justifying the title of the book and the book's persistent animus against Lincoln, the event needs more direct evidence and more specific documentation.

In the last analysis, Tredway's conclusions are unconvincing as well as mutually contradictory. His use of evidence is clumsy. However, the evidence itself is interesting. The social history from county newspapers, the examination of the testimony from the treason trials, and the sketches of the defendants in those trials make interesting reading. The book offers little or nothing in the way of quantitative evidence, but it is the product of much research in manuscript collections and newspapers. Tredway's book will interest the reader, but I doubt that it will convince him.

## The Impeachment of Andrew Johnson: Recent Articles

Michael Les Benedict, the author of the book on the impeachment and trial of Andrew Johnson reviewed in the *Lincoln Lore* for November, 1973, published "A New Look at the Impeachment of Andrew Johnson" in the *Political Science Quarterly* for September, 1973. The article discusses only the impeachment (not the trial) and is written more for the student of law or government interested in the event as a precedent than for the student of Reconstruction history.

Stanley I. Kutler, himself the author of a book on *Judicial Power and Reconstruction Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), reviews Benedict's book in the issue of *Reviews in American History* for December, 1973. Kutler uses Benedict's book to counter the argument of Raoul Berger's *Impeachment: The Constitutional Problems* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973). It is Berger's contention that impeachment should be subject to judicial review. Berger, the lawyer, has more faith in judges than Benedict and Kutler, the historians. Berger's distrust of legislators is based on the old-fashioned view of Andrew Johnson's impeachment as the result of political vindictiveness. Yet Berger's own book argues that impeachment need not be confined to cases of indictable criminal action. He fails to make the logical leap that Benedict did. Reasoning that the legislators did not ignore constitutional re-

straint, Benedict could reevaluate the whole story of Johnson's impeachment.

The Congressional elections of 1866 and 1867 figure prominently in any estimate of Reconstruction politics and Andrew Johnson's presidency. Benedict stressed the election of 1867 in his book. Lawrence N. Powell gives a refreshing look at the "Rejected Republican Incumbents in the 1866 Congressional Nominating Conventions" in the September, 1973 issue of *Civil War History*. Powell shows that traditional election practices such as the rotation of candidates in accordance with their residence in two- or three-county Congressional districts caused many elections to turn on issues other than ones involving national Reconstruction. He thus challenges the assumption that the 1866 election was a radical sweep, even suggesting that in many cases candidates were rejected regardless of their stance on Reconstruction.

Since Richard E. Neustadt's work was mentioned in the historiographical introduction to the *Lincoln Lore* article on Johnson's impeachment, perhaps his most recent work deserves notice. In *The New York Times Magazine* of October 14, 1973, Neustadt reconsiders presidential power in an article entitled "The Constraining of the President."



From the Lincoln National Life Foundation

The Declaration of Independence rejected the rule of a monarch, and Americans ever since have pictured Presidents who seem to exceed their official powers as kings. Thomas Nast drew Andrew Johnson as King Richard III for the *Harper's Weekly* of July 25, 1868. Johnson was made to appear as Shakespeare's despot searching for any horse to ride to power, whether it be a Republican, Democratic, or Conservative horse. The cartoon appeared after the Democratic Convention of 1868 nominated Horatio Seymour to run for the presidency.

1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900

